

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/548,730	LEFKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ahmed M. Farah	3735	

All Participants:

(1) Ahmed M. Farah.

(2) Adam L. Stroud (Reg. No. 48,410).

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 June 2006

Time: 1:15 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

2-5, 7, 8 and 11-13

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

In the Examiner's Answer in response to the Appeal Brief filed on February 24, 2003, claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 14-16, were rejected; and claims 2-5, 7, 8 and 11-13 were objected as depending from rejected/non-allowed claims. The decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed on December 20, 2005, affirmed the Examiner's rejection with respect to claims 1, 10, 12 and 14-16 and reversed with respect to claims 6 and 9 (see Appeal No. 2005-2088).

In the Office Action mailed on March 14, 2006, the applicant was given a ONE MONTH TIME PERIOD in which to present the dependent claims 6 and 9 in independent form to avoid abandonment of the application.

However, in addition to claims 6 and 9, the applicant's amendment filed on April 6, 2006, presents claims 2- 5, 7, 8 and 11-13. This amendment is considered non-responsive (see MPEP § 1214.06). The Examiner contacted the applicant's representative, Adam L. Stroud (Reg. No. 48,410), via telephone to resolve this issue. Furthermore, minor informalities in claims 6 and 9 were also discussed. Claims 2- 5, 7, 8 and 11-13 were cancelled according to 37 CFR 1.197. As to claims 6 and 9, the applicant's representative authorized the examiner to correct the informalities by Examiner's Amendment (see the attached Examiner's Amendment)..